

Remarks

Claims 21, 25, 27-29 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the application.

Amendments to Specification

In order to correct minor typographical errors, formatting inconsistency and address the inconsistent use of reference numeral 100 in the specification, but not drawings as identified by the Examiner. A substitute specification is enclosed. As required by 37 C.F.R. 1.125(c), a clean and marked-up version of the specification are enclosed. Applicant submits that the enclosed substitute specification contains no new matter.

In particular, the following amendments were made to the specification. Page one of the specification has been amended to remove all extraneous information, up to and including "TITLE OF THE INVENTION." Paragraph 15, first bullet section, has been amended to correct a minor typographical error in the application number; delete the reference to the attorney docket number; and provide the U.S. patent number and issue date. Paragraph 15, second and third bullet sections, have been amended to delete the reference to the attorney docket number. Paragraph 18, 28, and 60 have been amended to delete reference numeral 100.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to Fig. 1 because it lacked label "100." As indicated above, the specification has been amended to delete all instances of reference numeral 100.

The Examiner also objected to Fig. 1 because items 20 and 40 should have been labeled 120 and 140, respectively. Applicant submits that the drawing sheet including Fig. 1 that was submitted on October 30, 2001 contain reference numerals 120 and 140. For the Examiner's convenience a copy of this drawing sheet is being provided along with this response. If the Examiner, believes that this new copy is a cleaner copy and would prefer to use it as a substitute for the October 30, 2001 drawing, then please enter the new copy of Fig. 1 as the formal drawing to be used going forward.

In view of the above, the Applicant believes that it has overcome the objections to the drawings noted by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 111, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 28 and 29 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem identified by the Examiner. Thus, the Applicant believes that it has overcome the rejection of claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 111, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,859,971 to Bittinger et al. Bittinger '971 teaches a form of differential caching dependent upon storing in a cache the contents of an entire data stream representative of all elements of a particular web page. When a subsequent request for a new data stream is made, the response data stream is intercepted, compared to the prior cache stored data stream and only the difference data is sent to a client. The client subsequently combines the difference data with the prior cached data stream to form all elements of a new web page.

In contrast, the present invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 21, and 25, utilizes a more sophisticated algorithm on what should be cached and what should be sent as difference data. In the present invention, a set of information (e.g., a web page or e-mail) to be communicated over a network is separated into static and dynamic portions. Only the static portion is cached and served from the cache for each page. The present invention does not rely on caching of entire data sets or web pages. The present invention caching algorithm is in stark contrast to Bittinger '971 which caches all elements of a set of information or web pages and at the time of serving a second subsequent set of information or web page, then sends only the difference between the two pages. Bittinger '971 caches both static and dynamic portions of the set of information or web pages.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Bittinger '971 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 13-20 depend from claim 12 and therefore are allowable over Bittinger '971 for the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and therefore are allowable over Bittinger '971 for the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and therefore are allowable over Bittinger '971 for the same reasons that claim 25 is allowable.

Thus, Bittinger '971 does not teach the present invention of caching only the static portion of a set of information as claimed . Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdrawn the rejection of claims 1-29.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-29 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Digital River, Inc.
By attorneys/agents:

MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER, PLLP
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 4850
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-8200

Date: 1 December 2004

By 
Shawn B. Dempster , Registration No. 34,321